DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 173 597 CE 022 067

AUTHOR Colmen, Joseph; Wurzburg, Gregory
TITLE Involving Schools in Employment and Training Programs for Youth.
INSTITUTION National Council on Employment Policy (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 31 May 79
CONTRACT DOL-23-11-77-06
NOTE 34p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Employment Programs; *School Community Cooperation; *School Involvement; *Youth Employment
IDENTIFIERS *Collaboration; *Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; *Local Educational Agencies; *Youth Employment Demonstrations Projects Act

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to review the progress that local CETA sponsors and LEAs have made towards collaboration. An analysis was made of early prime sponsors and LEA experience under YEDPA based upon the first three parts of a four-part evaluation conducted by the National Council on Employment Policy of YEDPA implementation in 37 CETA prime sponsorships. The implementation study included extensive discussion about CETA-LEA agreements, the mechanics of local change and the difficulties encountered along the road to collaboration. Data for analyzing channels of influence to local schools other than CETA prime sponsors were obtained from a number of interviews, meetings and "mini-case studies" in Baltimore, Maryland, and Springfield and Columbus, Ohio, conducted in the summer and fall of 1978. Interviews were held with representatives of those national educational organizations or institutions which previously had taken action to stimulate or reinforce linkages between the education community and the employment/training community, or were in a position to influence the education community to do so. It was concluded that (1) it will take time and follow-up policies for interest in YEDPA to build; and that (2) this must begin at the local level. (CT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CE

ED173597

INVOLVING SCHOOLS IN EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR YOUTH

CE 022 067

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gregory K. Wurzburg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Note

The authors thank the educators and manpower experts at the national, state and local levels who cooperated with us during the preparation of this report. We also thank Richard Graham, Corinne Rieder, and Justine Rodriguez for their comments on earlier drafts, and Nancy Kiefer for overseeing preparation of the report. The analyses and conclusions are the authors'.

Dr. Joseph Colmen
President
Education and Public Affairs

Gregory Wurzburg
Executive Director
National Council on Employment Policy

May 31, 1979

This report was prepared under contract #23-11-77-06 with the U.S. Department of Labor. The views do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of Labor

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Current Policy

One of the hallmarks of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act has been its repeated emphasis on linking local CETA prime sponsor employment and training programs with other local agencies. The various mandates for collaboration have produced few results, however, for lack of mechanisms to facilitate the process of, or of incentives sufficient to overcome the obstacles to cooperation.

The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 includes the usual exortations for collaboration, especially between CETA sponsors and local education agencies. But the Act also includes a specific mechanism to spur it: a provision under the Youth Employment and Training Program reserving 22 percent of each sponsor's formula allocation to be administered under the terms of an agreement between the sponsor and the local education agency (agencies).

The importance of the YETP 22 percent set-aside cannot be overstated. It has set in motion the forces necessary for genuine collaboration between the education establishment and the employment and training establishment. In isolated instances, usually where schools and CETA offices were already working together, alternative education programs and other joint ventures are thriving.

The 22 percent set-aside appears to be necessary, but it is not sufficient for collaboration. For the most part, the results of CETA-LEA collaboration are uncertain, formal agreements notwithstanding, because there are considerable impediments to progress in the collaborative process. Administrative and substantive differences between the two institutions stand in the way. Nonfinancial incentives (or the removal of disincentives) are necessary along with more substantive guidance with regard to program models and institutional roles. So far, there is no definite policy or set of mechanisms to move the tentative CETA-LEA partnerships beyond their present stage.

In the final analysis, collaboration between the manpower and education establishments can be successful only if it is accepted at the local level. The challenge is coaxing along the two disparate parties. Cases of healthy CETA-LEA partnerships as well as cases in which there are chronic ill feelings between CETA prime sponsors and local educators bear out the conclusion that financial incentives alone are not sufficient to push the collaborative programs already established beyond the rudimentary stage, or even sustain the progress achieved so far. Because of the administrative authority that local CETA sponsors have to the Department of Labor, they can be "won over" by way of the normal prime sponsor channel. But because local schools have no accountability to the Labor Department and little accountability to the U.S. Office of Education, the route for influencing

them must be less direct. They certainly cannot be coerced. Instead, models for policies, programs, and collaboration are needed. If they can be used to convince local educators about the importance of employment and training programs for youth, the validity of a role for them in those initiatives, and the feasibility of developing those roles, perhaps their cooperation can be won. CETA prime sponsors, however, are not the ones to provide LEA officials with information or guidance. While they are applying the outside pressure for change in schools, they are not equipped, nor do they have the standing in the education community to direct such change. The objective then is to utilize alternate channels for influencing local education policymakers.

The Next Step

The U.S. Department of Labor is already relying on the cooperation of educators in a number of interest groups and associations to identify exemplary employment and training programs based in schools and models for collaboration between schools and CETA prime sponsors. The Department has also undertaken a number of joint programs with the U.S. Office of Education in implementing and evaluating YEDPA. The leadership in the Office of Career Education and Bureau of Adult and Vocational Education has been especially cooperative, endorsing the concept of CETA-LEA partnerships and using the access they have to local schools to provide ideas and encourage progress. Additional measures and a clear articulation of some current ad hoc policies seem necessary though.

1. Because institutions seem most subject to change in response to pressure initiated from the outside and endorsed on the inside, the Department of Labor ought to continue its strategies of relying on education groups that already support a manpower-education partnership for youth, to persuade other educators.

2. Changing institutions by adding on new functions is probably easier than changing them by adapting old functions to serve new purposes. Although the U.S. Office of Education is cooperating with the Department of Labor in supporting the new initiatives under YEDPA, there are education laws already on the books that can serve some of the same purposes as YEDPA. USOE ought to review implementation of those laws and determine whether they might be implemented differently to better complement YEDPA.

3. A common complaint in the education community is that educators (with the exception of vocational educators) were not consulted during the development of YEDPA. Debate skipped the question of <u>whether</u> education should take a role in employment and training programs, in favor of the matter of defining <u>how</u> education should be involved.

Because educators feel YEDPA was done to them, it still lacks the whole-hearted support of even the Washington education establishment, to say nothing of other educators around the country. The single most feasible strategy for coalescing support of the education and employment and training institutions around a single purpose might be to create a shared vested

interest between them by developing new legislation through a joint process involving education and manpower interests.

4. Because of the federal character of traditional employment and training programs and the reluctance of the federal government to take an activist role in local education affairs, the notion of CETA-LEA linkages may pose something of a dilemma for policymakers concerned with maintaining the autonomy of local schools. But since LEA cooperation in YETP is optional for schools, policymakers should not adopt the alternative suggested by some educators of giving LEAs unilateral authority over YETP set-aside funds. This is because where sponsors have abdicated authority over the set-aside, the resulting school programs frequently have been conducted without regard to overall YETP program objectives or other CETA youth programs. A lack of prime sponsor authority in these cases has reduced the effectiveness of YEDPA dollars and, more importantly, provides little incentive or pressure for changing the programs schools provide or improving their services to economically disadvantaged youth.

In order to assure the independence of LEAs, however, while giving them a piece of the manpower pie, it might be desirable to funnel a portion of what would otherwise be prime sponsor allocations down to the local level by way of state education agencies, and require LEA officials to administer that money under the terms of an agreement negotiated with CETA sponsors.

5. Whatever the respective roles that CETA sponsors and LEAs may take in jointly-supported local education/training/employment "systems" for youth, the development of such systems will take time. National policymakers ought to take this into account in establishing objectives and timetables, or expectations will outrun what is feasible.

INTRODUCTION

The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 (PL 95-93, Title III) is the federal government's most recent response to the crisis of youth unemployment. It is an add-on to CETA but includes provisions that present a marked departure from past federal manpower initiatives. One of the most important features of the 1977 legislation is its emphasis on tying local manpower programming for youth to the system of public education. Both the Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects (YCCIP) and the Youth Employment and Training Program (YETP) call for development and reinforcement of linkages between a community's employment-training (CETA) organization and its local education agencies (LEAs). More significantly, under YETP, a minimum of 22 percent of each local sponsor's allocation is reserved to be administered under the terms of a prime sponsor-LEA jointly-approved program for employment and training services.

Although the notion of mixing education with employment and training is neither radical nor novel, collaboration between schools and manpower agencies has seldom come easy. Coaxing local manpower administrators, though not simple, is a fairly direct process, thanks to the accountability they have to the U.S. Department of Labor. But convincing officials and teachers in LEAs is another story. Numerous conditions and influences affect the posture of LEAs towards joining education and manpower services for YEDPA eligible youth. Some of these grow out of school policy related, for example, to length of the school day, credentialing of staff, the award of academic credit, or out of experience schools have had serving economically disadvantaged youth or underachievers. Other factors affecting LEAs' posture towards linking manpower and education grow out of a complex network of influence exerted by interest groups with their often conflicting objectives, programs and procedures. These various influences are complicated further by a less than tidy network of governmental interests (federal, state and local), the many professional organizations representing one or another specialized constituency, the internal organization of a local school system, and its constituencies in the community it serves.

From evidence collected so far in case studies conducted by the National Council on Employment Policy on implementation of YEDPA, it is clear that the 22 percent set-aside for CETA-LEA agreements is a useful starting point for improving relationships between local CETA sponsors and schools, and for developing institutional complementarity; but that alone is not sufficient for obtaining the level of results demanded by existing program goals.

It is the purpose of this report first to review the progress that local CETA sponsors and LEAs have made towards collaboration, and then to offer some strategies for improving the durability and long-term usefulness of the joint CETA-LEA ventures. In order to achieve the second purpose of this report, it is necessary to identify and analyze the diverse influences

that bear on public schools as they establish procedures and make policy, and to persuade them to support an expanded school role in youth employment and training programs.

The presumption of this report is that in formulating policy, school administrators look beyond financial incentives for their policy cues. Federal and state laws, regulations and guidelines, and their accompanying legislative histories, of course, are important. But so too are the platforms, statements of belief and objectives of professional or political national and state organizations, and professional journals, reports, and research. More direct approaches involving workshops, seminars, lectures, or clinics for local staff also shape local policy.

This analysis starts with a review of prime sponsor-LEA experience under YEDPA so far. It then investigates the systems of governance under which LEAs operate, the less formal networks of influence upon them, and the part they have played in advancing YEDPA goals in local school systems.

METHODOLOGY

The analysis of early prime sponsors and LEA experience under YEDPA -- YETP in particular -- is based upon the first three parts of a four-part evaluation conducted by the National Council on Employment Policy of YEDPA implementation in 37 CETA prime sponsorships. The implementation study includes extensive discussion about CETA-LEA agreements, the mechanics of local change and the difficulties encountered along the road to collaboration. The findings most useful for this analysis are in the second and third implementation reports, August 1978 and March 1979 respectively.

Data for the second part of this report analyzing channels of influence to local schools other than CETA prime sponsors, were obtained from a number of interviews, meetings and "mini-case studies" conducted in the Summer and Fall of 1978. Interviews were held during July, August and September 1978 with representatives of those national educational organizations or institutions which previously had taken action to stimulate or reinforce linkages between the education community and the employment/training community, or were in a position to influence the education community to do so. The organizations represented in these interviews were:

-- American Vocational Association (60,000 vocational educators)

-- American Personnel and Guidance Association (42,000 guidance and counseling specialists)

-- National Parent-Teacher Association (6.5 million membership)

-- National School Boards Association (16,000 local school districts)

-- Council of Great City Schools (28 largest urban school systems)

-- American Association of School Administrators (20,000 members)

-- Institute for Educational Leadership

-- American Federation of Teachers (2,500 locals)

-- American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (925 community college members of the 1,235 existing)

-- National Manpower Institute, Work-Education Consortium (33 communities)

-- National Governors' Association (all states)

-- National Conference of State Legislatures (represents 7,600 state legislators)

-- Council of Chief State School Officers (all states)

-- National Association of State Boards of Education (51 of 57 state boards)

-- Office of Career Education, U.S. Office of Education

-- Bureau of Vocational, Occupational and Adult Education, U.S. Office of Education

"Mini-case study" visits were made to the City of Baltimore and the Maryland State Education Agency and to Springfield and Columbus, Ohio, and the Ohio Education Agency. The community visits were not undertaken with the expectation that universal or definitive strategies could be formulated. Rather, the objective was to map the local leverage points in a small number of school systems in order to provide some notion of the complexities of the mechanics of CETA-LEA collaboration and the size of achieving that on a grand scale. The conclusions are merely suggestive of the national picture, and might be regarded mainly as hypotheses for testing with further research or issues that ought to be considered in the process of policy formulation.

WHY MIX SCHOOL AND WORK?

One of the most important features of YEDPA is the provision reserving a minimum of 22 percent of each prime sponsor's allocation under the Youth Employment and Training Program to be administered under the terms of an agreement between the sponsor and local education agencies. The provision was included in the law in the hopes that it would provide an incentive for schools and CETA systems to work together. In the words of Senator Jacob Javits, a co-sponsor of the provision:

> ... competition between prime sponsors and local education agencies has been the rule, while cooperation has been the exception. There is a need to nudge these two competing systems closer together, so that the in-school labor force can be served in a more efficient and sensible manner.

Citing the Senate report on YEDPA, he added:

> The Committee believes it is essential that cooperation take place between prime sponsors and local education agencies in providing employment opportunities and training and supportive services for youths enrolled in school. In the absence of such linkages, in-school youth may continue to be served by two separate and competing delivery systems which bifurcate their labor market experience at a critical stage of their transition between school and work.*

The Department of Labor willingly adopted as one of its objectives, the tying together of education and CETA, but expressed a tone of caution:

> ... /T/he mandate for a local education agency (LEA)-CETA agreement will not by itself achieve educational reform or a significant restructuring of service delivery systems in most cases. We see it as a way to make the education and manpower "camps" sit down and talk together about their problems, progress, and aims in dealing with youth.**

Not willing to put all its eggs in one basket, the Department provided discretionary money to support a number of exemplary in-school youth job programs and stressed ties between sponsors and LEAs for the purpose of awarding academic credit under the Youth Community Conservation and

---

*Congressional Record, Senate, July 21, 1977, p. S-12558.

**Office of Youth Programs, U.S. Department of Labor, "A Planning Charter for the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977," August 1977, pp. 7-8.

Improvement Projects (YCCIP). The Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects (YIEPP), an experimental initiative testing whether a guaranteed job encourages youths to stay in school requires, by virtue of its design, some degree of cooperation between sponsors and schools. But cooperation under YCCIP is occurring generally where sponsors and schools were already getting along. Under YIEPP, some degree of cooperation was necessary for sponsors to survive the stiff competition for the limited number of YIEPP grants. Furthermore, less than 4 percent of all sponsorships were awarded entitlement projects.

The first interesting question then is not whether schools and prime sponsors can work together; there are always the exceptions to prove they can. The question is, instead, can such cooperation be encouraged across all sponsorships, even where there is no history of cooperation between schools and the manpower community? Or, more to the point, how effective has the current 22 percent set-aside under YETP been in encouraging local schools and CETA prime sponsors to work together? A second question is, if other strategies are needed, what might they be?

IS 22 PERCENT ENOUGH?

The education establishment is, by reputation, a rigid and inflexible one that some critics say changes only slowly. But the last two decades have demonstrated that public schools are not totally isolated from changes in the rest of society, and that they can respond to policy emphases coming out of Washington as different societal needs have appeared or as findings from research dictated better ways of accomplishing existing goals. In the post-Sputnik era, science and math instruction were upgraded in order to help put America's technological research and development on a par with that of the Soviet Union; sex, drug and alcohol education, counseling and guidance services, and career education have all been responses to more recent concerns.

Unfortunately, the public schools, by and large, have not shown much predisposition to participate in youth employment and training despite more than 15 years of coexistence with local programs. But at least part of the reluctance to change can be attributed to the fact that the changes implied in the calls for a greater education role in the employment and training administration have not been coming from within the education establishment, but from outside, frequently as part of an explicit criticism of public education. And while there are ample precedents for important changes in American public education, there are really no precedents for change as controversial as that embodied in YETP being forced by agents outside the education establishment.

Evaluations of the implementation of YEDPA, nevertheless, show that YEDPA is contributing to some change that appears necessary, but is far from sufficient for long-lasting and useful institutional change.

YETP in particular has succeeded in shifting the immediate focus of debate among local educators from the question of <u>whether</u> education should

play a deliberate role in enhancing the employability of youth, to what that role should be. This does not mean that educators have decided that employment and training can mix with education. Local educators are now engaged in initiatives that try the mix, though. The implication is that when and if the first debate is resumed, it will have more basis in experience than conjecture.

In the first year, there has been a record of some success and really no instances of outright failure among the 37 prime sponsors examined by the YEDPA implementation study sponsored by the National Council on Employment Policy.

Cooperation between prime sponsors and local schools is not an untried concept, and in many areas, there is a history of joint efforts that predate CETA. There, YETP money is paying for work experience components added on to career awareness and skill training, and in some instances, is providing money for extra staff in the LEAs or for liaison staff between LEA and prime sponsors.

Most prime sponsors, however, started with no established links. Before YEDPA they and the respective local schools operated in relative isolation in spite of their supposed common interest: preparing youths for adulthood. The effect of YEDPA in these areas is more noticeable and, hence, more dramatic. Virtually all prime sponsors succeeded in signing agreements with the local schools. But, many of the initial agreements were not thought through in the crisis climate of implementation, and reflected more the aspirations of some enlightened individuals (and the rhetoric of the Department of Labor) than feasible prospectives for action. The hasty, mid-semester start of the first year programs did not provide adequate opportunity for them to be properly implemented. The prevalent pattern for the second year of programs in the 1978-1979 school year was to simply continue the first year designs.

Even with a second year for extending programs under CETA-LEA agreements, local CETA sponsors and LEAs are almost certainly not going to be able to put in place the kind or quality of collaborative programs envisioned by the architects of YEDPA, because the process of getting the two systems to work together requires more than an orderly planning and implementation period. The process requires solutions to some fundamental problems that underlie attempts to collaboration, and time for local planners to find alternate routes around major barriers.

Pulling The Systems Together

The process of pulling together the education and employment and training institutions is occurring in two phases. The first is one of administrative detente and the second is substantive collaboration. In the familiarization process leading up to administrative detente, CETA sponsors have been trying to live down bad local histories of manpower-education

relations or the more general problem of a bad CETA reputation, and then getting past the frictions caused by procedural differences between the two establishments. Thanks possibly to its separate authorizing legislation and the fact that considerable resources are earmarked for local schools, YEDPA was not perceived by most schools as another CETA program or add-on to pre-CETA youth programs. This was an achievement whose significance should not be underestimated since it appears that a large part of the objection some local educators have had to mixing manpower and education has really been an objection to working with the manpower establishment.

Procedural differences have contributed to more serious chronic friction. The fiscal year for CETA sponsors starts in October, while for schools it starts in September, January or July. This mismatch plus the accelerated, patchwork style of CETA planning which frequently is not complete until days before the start of the new year (or even after the start of the new year) have made it difficult for schools to engage in long-range strategic plans. Another point of friction encountered in planning for the 78-79 school year programs (but not encountered in 77-78 because of delayed start-up) was uncertainty over funding levels and some doubt about whether changes made in the basic CETA legislation would also affect the youth programs. CETA-LEA collaboration in the first year of YEDPA also was hindered by its late, mid-semester start-up (January-March 1978). While these were one-time or only occasional problems, CETA's comparatively brief history has been riddled with periods of funding uncertainty, constantly shifting priorities, and changing regulations. The instability that this has built into the CETA system is not likely to be corrected overnight and is bound to present a chronic source of friction in CETA-LEA relations.

Another mismatch between local schools and CETA systems is their networks of accountability. LEAs are accountable to local boards of education, perhaps some other local officials, and state education authorities. CETA sponsors are also accountable to local officials but usually not the same ones as schools, and the U.S. Department of Labor. The procedural difficulties caused by these two separate systems having to clear their actions with their respective authorities can cause delays and be a serious hindrance to a long-term stable relationship.

In the process of achieving administrative detente there has also been a number of differences between CETA systems and schools that can, perhaps, best be attributed to the two institutions being at different stages in the bureaucratic aging process. The education establishment is old compared to almost any other public institution and ancient compared to the CETA system. Career structures, administrative models, professional interest groups, and credentialing standards are firmly in place. Tradition and established procedures are resistant to major changes. In short there is an institutional identity and -- more importantly -- continuity. The CETA system is a stark contrast.

Manpower did not emerge as a governmental policy area until the early 1960s. The Manpower Administration in the U.S. Department of Labor, which has been the focal point for all federally supported manpower initiatives, was not established until 1963. It has been the only permanent fixture on

the employment and training landscape in the relatively brief time since then (it did change its name to the Employment and Training Administration in 1975). The present network of CETA sponsors has been in place only since 1974. The hybrid manpower field has a fluid literature and lacks consensus on the most basic paradigms. Local expertise in employment and training affairs is more political and managerial than substantive because grantsmanship and outguessing Congress and the Department of Labor are prerequisites for survival. Substantive know-how is useful but not indispensable because so much of local policy is made in Washington.

The local CETA systems are also unstable organizationally. They have frequently attracted talented and capable administrators, but have been unable to retain them in the atmosphere of fiscal and programmatic uncertainty. The lack of opportunity to formulate local policy and the frustration of having to respond to the whims of Washington effectively reduce incentives for creativity and excellence. The consequent high staff turnover, besides complicating the challenge of day-to-day management virtually erases institutional memory. Though local institutions, CETA offices are entirely federally funded. They have fared well financially, but their reliance on federal money and chronic last minute uncertainties over their budgets have undermined their perceived staying power to the point that some local offices are seen as being perpetually on the brink of collapse.

The marked differences in the character of the LEA and CETA bureaucracies inevitably present sources of friction. While there are sufficient instances to demonstrate that CETA sponsors and LEAs can work together, in fact the bureaucratic differences create friction that can provide convenient pretexts for either partner breaking off collaboration. Since there are intuitively appealing reasons for the two systems to collaborate, however, the question is whether the substantive differences are sufficient to rule out joint efforts. If they are not, it seems that if there is a will to work together, there can be a way.

In the second stage of the process in which local schools and CETA sponsors begin working together -- that of substantive collaboration -- there appears to be less pervasive points of friction between the two systems. Some are based on misinformation. But to the extent others are based on attitudinal differences, they can pose systemic obstacles to complementary systems. Initially, a few educators voiced concern that CETA's emphasis on job placements would encourage that system to push youths out of school into jobs. In fact, the expressed purpose of the legislation is to encourage youths to stay in school and both the Department of Labor and local CETA administrators have taken steps to remove incentives that might entice youth to drop out. There have been no substantiated reports of students leaving school to take YEDPA jobs, and so that issue has subsided.

Targeting employability services by income has not subsided as an issue. Although CETA administrators, as a rule, are locked into restricting services to economically disadvantaged youths, school administrators object on substantive and political grounds. They do not believe family income is a reasonable predictor of need for employability services, and they are

accountable to a constituency that is much broader than CETA sponsors' and therefore less tolerant of provisions that reserve services for only a few.

The emphasis on serving the dropout population now, as in the past, is another point of contention. The CETA system and its predecessors have traditionally served dropouts, blaming schools for failing to adequately serve kids who did not fit the normal mode. Some local educators are objecting to YEDPA now because programs are designed to "recycle" dropouts back into regular channels. One principal complained that "... the very ones that had been kicked out used CETA as a way to get back into the system." Most educators, though, do not appear adverse to making another try with dropouts. The controversy arises in the debate over what constitutes effective alternative educational systems for those persons.

The most heated CETA-LEA controversy has been over the award of academic credit for work experience or employability development training. Some local discussions have centered on the question of whether credit for employment-related experience devalues or deemphasizes credit for academic areas. In states where seniors must demonstrate basic competencies to graduate, teachers sometimes object to any school experience that detracts from preparation for those exams. There is also a question of whether local educators can make policy regarding the award of credit without specific state mandates on the subject. These debates have frequently, however, been used as smokescreens to conceal the real issue: the turf question of who decides what is credit-worthy experience; schools or CETA sponsors? Educators see the certification process as properly a school role. Employment and training personnel concede that it is appropriately a school responsibility, but then go on to criticize schools for being too reluctant to support activities involving credit and more to the point, unwilling to make an extra effort to establish education alternatives for YEDPA-eligible youth. In some areas where credit is awarded for work experience or career awareness training, observers note educators providing no more oversight than sponsors had proposed, but a share of the YEDPA pie has succeeded in buying their cooperation.

None of the problems encountered in the CETA-LEA relations is unanticipated, insuperable or irreconcilable. They may provide credible pretexts for inaction, however, where local sponsors or schools are not inclined to cooperate because they do not see the value in it or know how to do so.

It appears that the 22 percent set-aside under YETP has been effective in encouraging local schools and CETA prime sponsors to approach one another. A linkage between education and manpower has, to a degree, been formalized. But, if the CETA-LEA linkages are to progress beyond "administrative detente," there has to be more substance built into them. While the developments so far do not preclude that from happening -- indeed a cooperative posture is a prerequisite to a truly productive relationship -- the strategies for making it happen are not so apparent.

CETA-LEA activities may acquire substance over time, but the likelihood of it happening, the value of the content, and the pace at which it develops are all problematical. These uncertainties are inherent in any attempt to push together at the local level two establishments that have vastly different superstructures or administration, statutory authority, political constituencies, institutional history, program objectives, and client groups. The peculiar need is for a strategy to coax collaboration between a federal system of prime sponsors operating manpower programs for youth and a state/local system of schools providing education for youth.

The Department of Labor is able to steer local sponsor programming into conforming somewhat to the Department's objective of better CETA-LEA relations through its regulatory authority and power over the purse. DOL is also providing to sponsors a degree of technical assistance and information about how CETA-LEA agreements can be set up and what they might look like.

The Department, however, has no authority to push local schools alone, and very few options for pulling them along. The 22 percent set-aside under YETP is the only real incentive, but DOL alone is not equipped to develop the technical assistance or program models that educators need. Even if it were, the DOL-prime sponsor channel is hardly an effective conduit. Local educators are not inclined to take the word, advice, or assistance of employment and training experts without the imprimatur of and collateral input from the education establishment.

EXPLORING ALTERNATIVE CHANNELS TO LEAs

The need for a collaborative effort between the employment and training and education establishments at levels other than the local level is necessary if local CETA-LEA programs are to work. This need was foreseen in the legislation which includes provisions that both require and encourage cooperation between manpower and education authorities at the state and national level. Five percent of the total YETP allocation is available to governors for providing, among other things, labor market and occupational information to prime sponsors and schools. The Act also authorizes the Secretary of Labor to carry out innovative and experimental programs that feature cooperative agreements with federal educational agencies. The 1978 CETA amendments further encourage manpower-education linkages above the local level by increasing the allocation to state vocational education authorities, to, in part, increase coordination between vocational education and CETA establishments. The amendments also reserve a portion of the governor's allocation to be used for coordinating the activities of state manpower services and state education agencies. To understand the potential utility of these provisions, it is useful to know something about the education establishment: its formal structure of governance and its informal channels for influence.

Local Governance

The heart of the public elementary and secondary education establishment is some 16,000 school districts in fifty states. Local public school systems are governed by school boards, and managed by superintendents. In most instances, school board members are elected by the voters of the community they serve, and are independent of the other local elected officials, mayors or county commissioners, for example. School districts also usually enjoy independent taxing authority. The lack of a common authority over local education agencies and other local political bases, which typically are the CETA sponsors, makes compatibility less than automatic and cooperation sometimes an heroic act.

Springfield, Ohio offers an extreme case of diffused authority. Schools there are independent of the rest of local government, and vocational education is administered separate from the other education programs. Nonvocational education is handled through the city school system which reports to the Springfield board of education. Vocational education is handled by county joint vocational schools which are supported by the Springfield Public Schools and other LEAs in Clark County, and administered by a county board of education.

The county joint vocational school has traditionally been involved with county manpower program initiatives through CETA Title I contracts with the county CETA office. Most of the services under those contracts have been for adults, however. and the prospects for adopting the vocational services for YEDPA-eligible youth are not promising. The JVS has a long waiting list of student applicants and the JVS administrators prefer to select for enrollment youth who do not have basic education deficiencies or other difficulties in school. Enrollment of YEDPA-eligible youth in JVS is unlikely also because the County's in-school YETP program is administered by the city school system's career education office. To further hinder cooperation between any city school YETP activities and JVS, the city school liaison with JVS is not in the career education office.

Although the Springfield city school system has established a strong CETA-LEA program with the area prime sponsor, top level support within the schools has been only lukewarm. The superintendent is wary of too close a relationship with the prime sponsor because administrators in the sponsorship report to the county government, and he does not want the schools accountable in any way to the latter.

The degree of cooperation that now exists between the Springfield city school system and the Clark County CETA office is no mean accomplishment, given the potential for conflicts within the education system serving residents in the county and the fact that the school systems and the CETA office are accountable to different authorities. The success in this instance, under conditions that seem almost to be designed to thwart cooperation, can be attributed to the willingness of the two parties involved. The prime sponsorship is a relatively small one with really only two levels of decisionmaking. It is one in which the youth coordinator has the confidence of and ready access to the sponsor's top administrator. Through conscientious management and a low-key style of doing business, the sponsorship has also managed to stay relatively free of political pressures from the county and been able to operate as an independent agent. Before the advent of YEDPA the sponsor staff had worked with the Joint Vocational School and so the staff was receptive to the YEDPA mandate for collaboration with schools.

The single most important factor contributing to cooperation on the part of the schools has been the presence of an energetic and imaginative career education coordinator responsible for conducting the city school's demonstration career education program funded with state career education money. Through his own efforts, he kept abreast of YEDPA as it evolved and was already roughing out plans for school involvement by the time the sponsor received notice of its 1978 YETP allocation. The fact that some higher-ups in the Springfield hierarchy were receptive to the notion of mixing school and CETA also helped immeasurably.

Columbus, Ohio is another case in which the schools and prime sponsors report to different authorities. Yet despite the fact that there is less fragmentation on the education side than is found in Clark County, Columbus CETA-LEA relations under YEDPA are less than cordial.

The history of manpower-education relations in Columbus has been one of conflict between a combative, talk-oriented manpower agency and an education agency that has kept a distance from manpower programs for youth, but does not appear unwilling to cooperate. The Columbus CETA office seems to be locked into a management policy of minimal change, and under the hectic YETP implementation conditions, was almost paralyzed. To the extent there was an identifiable policy for the YETP 22 percent set-aside, it was to resist the involvement of the public schools. In both 1978 and 1979 the prime sponsor practically forced nonfinancial agreements upon the local schools that assured only a token role for educators. These have been in lieu of the more substantive role originally proposed by the schools in the YETP proposal they submitted for 1978, but which the sponsor rejected for being unresponsive to the problem of youth and because the schools wanted more autonomy than the sponsor was willing to grant.

In a relatively small proportion of cases, mayors or other chief elected officials have direct authority over school board members and/or school superintendents. When this occurs, the chief officials' line of authority can be exercised over both manpower and education officials. Not surprisingly, when the priorities of the chief elected officials include linking employment and training initiatives to education, the importance of mechanisms fostering cooperation between CETA and LEAs fades, and administrative and substantive differences can be minimized by forced agreement instead of mutual agreement. But even this structure of governance cannot guarantee harmony or totally productive CETA-LEA relationships.

Baltimore is one of the minority of school systems in which the school board is appointed by the mayor; the board, in turn, appoints the superintendent. Under these circumstances, both the city's manpower administrator and chief school officer receive their policy guidance from the city's top executive. The mayor's policy with respect to youth, employability, and education is that schools and the manpower agency are expected to work together towards solving the city's youth manpower problems. To the extent there is significant effort by the schools today, therefore, in addressing youth employment and training needs, it is felt to be influenced in large part by the fact that the mayor ordered it.

Without that unified authority, it does not seem likely that the Baltimore CETA sponsor and the LEAs would have worked together as well as they have. Perceived school resistance to providing for the educational needs of dropouts led the mayor to place administrative supervision of one major alternative education program for dropouts in the hands of the manpower agency. Under this arrangement, the schools provide teachers for curriculum development and instruction, but the teaching staff is accountable, in part, to the manpower agency. Employment and training programs for the in-school population have been organized within the school system's vocational education department. The manpower agency cooperates in developing work experience slots for CETA eligible youth in the programs. In addition, skills centers are being instituted in the schools, but oversight responsibility goes to the mayor's manpower and economic development representatives.

In other communities, where there is no single policy authority over CETA sponsors and LEAs, cooperation does occur, as, for example, in Springfield, Ohio. The impact seems to be lessened. However, the permanence of change is uncertain, and the pace of change may be slower.

Other Influences on LEAs

Local governance is not the only factor impinging directly on LEAs, and indirectly on prime sponsors. There are less structured influence networks at work that school administrators find at times to be no less compelling than formal authority. Even in Baltimore which by most measures, seems to have achieved effective involvement of local schools, and where there is no lack of formal guidance, local job markets and employer attitudes have a powerful influence on the role that schools take in manpower programs. The highly competitive industrial job market in downtown Baltimore attracts jobseekers from the city as well as from the growing Baltimore suburbs. In this climate, the schools admit that they "cream" in the selection and placement of work experience students, in order to demonstrate the quality of student the schools can produce and beat out the competition from suburban schools.

There is a strong suggestion that schools which have developed productive linkages with the business and industries of their communities are better able to mount successful youth employment programs, particularly as work experience, cooperative education, and job placement are concerned.

In Baltimore, there has been a history of highly visible involvement of industry with schools since civil disturbances in Baltimore in the mid-1960s. Following those disturbances, several business leaders in the city who were concerned about the role the private sector could play in improving life in the city, formed a group that started taking a critical look at the schools and offering suggestions for improvements. Significantly, the schools proved receptive to the criticism and to making changes.

Since it was established, the group representing both employers and schools has served as an umbrella organization sponsoring programs to upgrade reading and arithmetic instruction, cosponsoring with the Maryland Council of Economic Education a project to assist teaching principles of economic education, underwriting a program to give all children greater awareness of the world of work, supporting a computerized, individualized learning project. The group and some of the corporations it represented also participated in a dropout prevention program funded with Elementary and Secondary Education Act money. More recently, several Baltimore businesses have taken part in "Adopt-a-School," a program in which individual corporations have developed cooperative relationships with nearby schools, and provide assistance in such activities as counseling, serving on vocational advisory committees, and providing opportunities for work experience, cooperative education and other job placement programs.

Schools have continued to be receptive to the partnership with the employers for a number of reasons. For one, industry is not telling the schools how to teach -- that is recognized as the schools' responsibility and expertise. For another, industry has assisted in finding jobs for students. Furthermore, industry has stayed out of the political arena where education priorities are set.

The linkages developed between Baltimore schools and businesses may be an important part of the foundation for the more recent CETA/YEDPA program initiatives. The concept of combined academic/work programs was tested and successfully applied by business and schools at their own direction, before YEDPA. The businesses saw economic gains in investing in education and training of students who would eventually find their way as employees into their plants and offices. The schools saw educational gains and the potential for more "relevant" education through contacts with a larger world outside the school building.

LEA ties to industry in Springfield and Columbus, Ohio, are less formalized and comprehensive than they are in Baltimore, and observations are certainly less conclusive when it comes to judging the impact that local businesses might have on LEA policy regarding school and work. In both areas the vocational components are, of course, sensitive to placement opportunities for graduates. But since the interests of local businesses appear to be short-term, extending only as far as getting trained workers at minimal cost, the only real influence they have is in encouraging schools to select the best qualified youth for participation. This simply reinforces a bias popularly attributed to vocational education, against serving "problem" youth, and it does not prod the vocational educators or other educators in the direction of more cooperation with prime sponsors. If anything, the situation militates against it.

One Model of Local Influence

The three ingredients that seem to be most important in determining the way the Baltimore business community has influenced the school system are a mutual perception of objectives that serve a common interest, a flexibility and willingness in the business community and the school system to undertake cooperative efforts, and time. These ingredients are important to keep in mind when considering the impact YETP can have on public education because they might be seen as the components of an effective model for long-term influence on a school system.

Assessing local CETA systems in terms of whether or not they can influence local educators in the same way, it appears that YETP has some handicaps to overcome. Maybe the most important one is time. Sustained relationships seem to be a prerequisite for changing LEAs for two reasons: First, because rapid change cannot be accommodated, and second, because sustained interest seems to be an indicator of commitment for which short-term funding and forceful rhetoric are poor substitutes. If the propensity of national policymakers for frequent shifts in manpower policy, and their impatience for quick results is any indicator of future patterns, there

appears to be little likelihood that YETP can provide the basis for a long-term relationship between LEAs and prime sponsors.

It is also not clear that the commitments of CETA prime sponsors to developing CETA-LEA linkages reflect genuine local sentiments. YETP money is federal, not local money and its purpose is seen to be supporting federal objectives which do not necessarily correspond to local objectives, and are therefore, not necessarily compelling.

Strengths that CETA YETP administrators have in their favor are flexibility and adaptability. The program allows sponsors the opportunity to implement a wide range of possible activities. But this can perhaps be parlayed better into a strength for dealing with LEAs not by CETA sponsor innovations, but by sponsors being permitted to go along with innovative projects developed by schools. There are two barriers preventing that from happening, though. The first is one of accountability for the YETP money; some sponsors are reluctant to loosen their grip on money if they still are ultimately responsible for funds that may be misspent. The second problem is more one of turf, like the one seen in Columbus, in which sponsors are unwilling to enter any relationships in which they do not have a strong upper hand. There, the CETA system is thwarting what meager influence employment and training policies can bring to bear on public schools.

State Level Influence on LEAs

In the formal scheme of things, local education agencies are actually creatures of the state. They exist at the sufferance of the state and have taxing authority, policy and administrative authority given them by state constitutions and laws. But, by tradition, LEAs have evolved as relatively autonomous units and the amount of actual influence that state education agencies, state school superintendents, and state boards of education have on them is not as great as the formal hierarchy might imply.

State education authorities are not effective leading dramatic departures from established policy and the status quo. They are not in a position to force unpopular policies on unwilling local educators. Although they can lead some policy change at the margin and provide technical assistance to help local schools along, they are not equipped nor inclined to direct state-wide policy overhauls, especially with regard to something as controversial and uncertain as YEDPA and policies for school participation under the YETP 22 percent set-aside provisions.

This does not imply that the role of SEAs has necessarily been one of disinterest or inaction. It does imply that state education agencies cannot be expected realistically to be agents of sweeping change in public school systems.

The two states studied for this evaluation present polar examples of the roles that states have taken in providing leadership with respect to the role that LEAs ought to take in local YETP programs. Ironically, the

local results of the state level efforts, although not absolutely conclusive, do not seem to differ remarkably.

The Maryland State Education Agency (SEA) has taken an active role at the local level disseminating information about YEDPA and encouraging LEAs to cooperate with CETA sponsors. Two months after enactment of YEDPA, the state education agency appointed a department-wide task force, which together with the State Manpower Planning Office, sponsored a meeting for LEAs and prime sponsors on YEDPA and stressed the need for strong linkages between the two. The heads of the education and manpower agencies also signed a letter endorsing CETA-education cooperation, and sent it to all CETA sponsors and LEAs in the state.

At the state level the SEA has taken an active role tying work and education together. The SEA itself was appointed prime sponsor for the Balance-of-State CETA program, and the SEA educational coordinator for CETA training sites on the state manpower planning council. Although the SEA appointed task force completed its charge after several more meetings, a SEA representative continues to contact prime sponsors and, when asked, provides technical assistance.

Aside from the state-level impacts of its activities, the impact of the state education agency's enthusiastic support is uncertain. Virtually all local CETA sponsors in Maryland successfully negotiated agreements with local schools. But virtually all prime sponsors in all states concluded CETA-LEA agreements with and without the help of state level administrators, and in Maryland, Baltimore city schools concluded their agreements with no help from the state. In the few cases where sponsors and LEAs had serious difficulty, the SEA provided outside encouragement and assistance until an agreement was reached. But, even in Maryland with its active state support for YEDPA, the state level education and manpower administrators have cultivated a restrained policy of providing specific guidance and help only when requested by local officials. Consequently, it seems that the state level education office may be providing useful assistance in the areas where schools had already accepted the basic policy of linking CETA and schools. But because of the receptive posture of schools in those areas, it seems safe to assume that sponsors and schools would have achieved some degree of success in implementing joint efforts even without assistance from the state. On the other hand, LEA officials who had already decided against cooperating with CETA sponsors would not have invited the state education officials in to provide assistance anyway.

The attitude of state level administrators in Ohio stands in contrast to what has been happening in Maryland. Neither the state education agency nor the state office of manpower development took much initiative in announcing YEDPA to local schools. The SEA's own involvement in CETA appears to have been nominal. Except for some level of funding for the independent career education pilot projects the state is supporting and a brief announcement (but nodis currian) about YETP at a state school superintendents' meeting, the state has provided no policy guidance with regard to linking schools and CETA sponsors. The only steps taken in the 15 months following enactment of YEDPA were the appointments of an SEA

representative to the state manpower council, and an employment and training representative to the state education council.

In Springfield, the only case observed in Ohio where an LEA actively pursued collaborative arrangements with the local prime sponsor, events proceeded independent of any appreciable state role. The only state involvement that might be identified would be the state support of a pilot career education project in the Springfield school system. The career education office has been the focal point for the LEA-CETA interface, and since the office would not exist without the state support, an indirect state role might be inferred. But, at best, it has been a very limited role. Despite the interest of the state in supporting several career education pilot projects, there has been a distinct lack of state leadership in providing them with technical assistance and certainly not state pressure guiding the content of local career education activities. The state career education administrators were silent with regard to how local career education projects might interact with YEDPA, or participate in CETA-LEA agreements.

The Ohio state education agency provided little guidance in the first 18 months of YEDPA to local administrators interested in developing policies with regard to the award of academic credit for work experience or employability development classes offered under YEDPA. In the absence of explicit state guidelines on the subject, LEAs were reluctant to go ahead on their own in awarding credit. In the second year, however, some LEAs, such as Springfield, have established modest provisions for awarding credit, but only for classroom experience. There are plans for the state to establish a number of pilot programs in local schools for the 1979-1980 school year, to test some models for the award of academic credit for work experience. Those models are expected to involve some variant of the present regulations which require school staff to monitor and evaluate student work assignments. The Maryland state education agency is more willing to relax the rules governing the award of academic credit for work experience, thanks to pressure from YEDPA interests inside and outside the SEA. But even in Maryland it seems likely that SEA endorsement of the credit for work policy espoused in YEDPA is more likely to manifest itself as a relaxation of current rules and not affirmative action to encourage local educators to award credit for YEDPA work experience.

The Federal Presence in Education

Because education has been, by tradition and as interpreted in constitutional law, a matter reserved ultimately to the states, the federal role in education has been supportive and supplemental, first as a statistics gathering agency, then as a research and demonstration agency. Only in the past few decades has the federal government attempted a more active role, stimulating state systems to advance the quality and equality of their education through a variety of economic incentives. More recently, the courts have lent a degree of enforcement authority to the federal education presence, largely in connection with pursuing equal educational opportunity.

The federal government, however, continues to take a backseat to state and local authorities in formulating educational policy. As a result, except in the arena of equal opportunity (including compensatory education), there is no definitive national education policy. The federal government's program interests are generally added on to the state and local priorities.

Furthermore, although federal education expenditures run into the billions of dollars, they are small in comparison to the state and local resources -- only about 8 percent of total education expenditures. Because of the primacy of state/local authority in public education, HEW is reticent to exercise enforcement power, and because the federal dollars are small relative to other revenues, local education agencies do not feel much urgency to be responsive to the wishes of the federal bureaucracy. This becomes most apparent when one observes the wide diversity of programs offered by schools and the widely varied priorities they assign to them.

Diversity of education programs from community to community is held dear, for political as well as educational reasons, because schools are held to be socializers, bringing the values and aspirations of the young closer to those of the community which supports them. It was primarily for this reason that today, twenty-five years after the Brown decision, the issue of school desegregation has not yet been totally resolved. It is no wonder, therefore, that even if the federal education establishment had gone full speed ahead supporting local CETA-LEA collaboration, it could not have leveraged much action at the local level. But, at least initially, the education establishment -- the federal part included -- was not inclined to go full speed ahead in support of YEDPA because it was not consulted in the process of YEDPA authorization. Hence, there was little reason or opportunity for the Office of Education to formulate policy to go hand-in-hand with the Department of Labor's implementation efforts.

In fact, however, in the months after YEDPA was signed into law, the USOE showed some willingness to go along on a cooperative basis with Labor Department's Office of Youth Programs. Judged by the standards of cooperation that existed between OE and DOL before YEDPA, the cooperation between the two agencies that exists now is something of a breakthrough. The mere lack of hostility between Labor and the vocational education office in OE would have been an improvement over the usual relationship that has existed. But the positive interest in collaboration and joint activities that the Office of Youth Programs has undertaken with the vocational educators and career educators in OE is unprecedented in HEW-DOL relations centering around CETA.

What the U.S. Office of Education is Doing Under YEDPA

Federal policy in support of YEDPA was initiated with an August 1977 memorandum of understanding signed jointly by the Secretaries of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare, to work together in a number of ways, including establishment of an interagency coordinating panel. HEW was to "seek

to ensure the involvement of local education agencies and organizations in the operation of youth programs ..." by developing new education and work models for dissemination to local school districts and CETA prime sponsors, and working with the Department of Labor on models for awarding academic credit for work experience. HEW also agreed to assess alternative education systems already in place or sponsored under YEDPA, and help establish and evaluate community and state level councils for encouraging collaboration between schools and employers.

In carrying out its responsibilities under this memorandum of understanding, HEW has already engaged in a number of projects with DOL including joint evaluations of CETA-LEA agreements, and is utilizing its channels to local officials to encourage cooperation between vocational education, career education, and post-secondary education components, and local manpower administrators implementing YEDPA.

USOE has been quite cooperative in adding YEDPA activities to its established workload. But achieving change by adding on new responsibilities is not the same as achieving change by making adaptations in old responsibilities. The education establishment in HEW might be able to leverage some of its influence under legislation other than YEDPA to support closer cooperation between education and preparation of youth for the world of work.

A review of current education legislation on the books provides some ideas for the potential access that the Office of Education has to local educational administrators, and more importantly, the existing overlap in purposes and objectives between this legislation and YEDPA. The laws now in force already establish program activities similar to, or at least consistent with some of those encouraged by YEDPA. They also establish precedents for income targeting provisions and steering education services to pupils not usually well-served.

While the extent of USOE authority over school districts is constrained by statute and tradition, existing legislation permits USOE to provide incentives through regulations and awards of particular discretionary projects for state and local education agencies to pursue some of the objectives of YEDPA. USOE can also influence state education agencies administering federal formula funded programs.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963, Title I, Part A, Subpart 1*
(Formula-funded with state authority)

- Sec. 101. Purpose: to assist /States/ to extend, improve, and where necessary, maintain existing programs of vocational education, to develop new programs ... and to provide part-time employment for youths who need the earnings ... to continue their vocational training on a full-time basis ....

*Emphasis added

- Sec. 105(a)(15). Any State which desires to participate in programs under this Act ... shall establish a State advisory council ... and shall include as members one or more individuals who represent the State Manpower Services Council ....

- Sec. 107(a)(1). /State five-year vocational education plans shall/ ... set out criteria ... for coordinating manpower programs conducted by /CETA prime sponsors/ with vocational education programs assisted under this Act ....

The Vocational Education Act of 1963, Title I, Part A, Subpart 2 (Formula-funded with state authority)

Work Study Programs

- Sec. 121(a)(2). Employment under /state-funded/ locally operated work study programs/ shall be furnished only to a student ... who is in need of such employment to commence or continue his vocational education program ....

Cooperative Vocational Education Programs

- Sec. 122(e). /State-funded/locally operated cooperative vocational education programs/ shall include provisions assuring that priority for funding cooperation vocational education programs through local educational agencies is given to areas that have high rates of school dropouts and youth unemployment ....

The Vocational Education Act of 1963, Title I, Part A, Subpart 4 (Formula-funded with state authority)

Special Programs for the Disadvantaged

- Sec. 140(a). .../T/o assist them in conducting special programs ... to pay the full cost of vocational education for disadvantaged persons.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (as amended 1978), Title I, Part A, Subpart 2 (Formula-funded with state authority)

Grants for Local Education Agencies in Counties with Especially High Concentrations of Children From Low-Income Families

- Sec. 117(a). /T/o provide additional assistance to local educational agencies in counties with especially high concentrations of children from low-income families ....

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (as amended 1978), Title III, Part F, Youth Employment (Federal discretionary authority)

- Sec. 341(a). The Commissioner shall carry out a youth employment program, the purpose of which shall be to prepare children to take their place as working members of society.

- Sec. 341(b). ... Support activities to ... (3) enhance job opportunities for youth in coordinating educational activities with youth employment activities, particularly those ... under CETA; (4) encourage educational agencies and institutions to develop means to award academic credit for competencies derived from work experience ....

The Career Education Incentive Act (Formula-funded with state authority)

- Sec. 3. Purpose: ... /T/o assist States and local educational agencies and institutions of post-secondary education, including collaborative arrangements with the appropriate agencies and organizations, in making education as preparation for work ... a major goal of all who teach and all who learn by increasing the emphasis they place on career awareness, exploration, decision-making and planning ....

- Sec. 8(a)(3). ... making payments to local education agencies for comprehensive programs including:
  - (A) developing and implementing comprehensive career guidance, counseling, placement and follow-up services ...
  - (D) developing and implementing work experiences for students whose primary purpose is career exploration ....

Post-secondary Educational Demonstration Projects (Federal discretionary authority)

- Sec. 11(a). ... /T/o arrange ... for the conduct of postsecondary educational career demonstration projects which
  - (2) have unusual promise of promoting post-secondary career guidance and counseling programs,
  - (3) show promise of strenghtening career guidance, counseling, placement, and follow-up services.

It is evident that there are many channels through which the Office of Education can influence schools to align themselves more closely with YEDPA, without direct pressure, but by providing guidance for LEAs that want it. As it is now, though, there is no unifying federal policy holding together the abundance of federal programs LEAs now operate. In community visits to Baltimore, Maryland, and Springfield, and Columbus, Ohio, there were no instances in which school systems had orchestrated their full spectrum of federal education resources in order to target on students needing employment services. The YETP set-aside was used as an additional entity, or new, independent programs were mounted with career education funding (although in Springfield, this was state rather than federal dollars) or other vocational education funding. It appeared that the concept of combining funds from several other federal authorities and building a program that, in toto, addressed the problem of youth employment in a comprehensive way, had not been developed; such a model certainly had not been implemented, at the state or local level. It seems that under the various authorities that already exist there is high potential for meeting those needs, with or even without the 22 percent set-aside. Such an approach could provide a base of funding that is contained within the education establishment, is somewhat more stable, and has the added attraction of being identified as an education program.

As a rule, there is a large gulf, however, between the potential and the actual utilization of existing legislation and USOE authority to serve some of the federal objectives embodied in YEDPA. Naturally, change requires time. But the danger is that even with time, the establishment in USOE, as in the states and LEAs, will not embrace the same priorities as the Department of Labor (regardless of the memorandum of understanding between the Secretaries of the Departments).

It is misleading, however, to treat the USOE "establishment" as a monolith. Indeed, it is capable of taking an aggressive role on certain issues regarding education and manpower. Career education is a case in point. "Career education" is a nebulous concept which its advocates describe as embracing all those activities and experiences through which one learns about work. It is visualized as beginning early in life and continuing throughout it, and taking place in and out of schools. Within schools, it is not intended to be treated as a separate course of study, but is integrated instead within all subject matter courses. It differs from vocational education, which is more often associated with structured course instruction leading to proficiency in specialized, occupation-specific skills.

The career education office in USOE, with only some $10 million in 1978, and little or no direct federal authority over state or local education agencies, managed to spur thousands of school districts toward comprehensive activity in the name of career education by dint of energetic leadership, effective public information tactics, effective technical assistance and judicious use of its limited dollars to involve diverse constituencies outside of the schools which, in turn, could persuade the schools to institute program efforts in which they were interested. Similary, it has been aggressively pushing the idea of collaboration between schools and CETA prime sponsors in the interest of better preparing youth for work. The

vocational education function, on the other hand, with federal outlays of approximately $750 million and considerably more legislative authority, appeared during the first year of YEDPA, to have resisted encouraging its professional constituents to address priorities like youth employment, thus failing to make significant policy impressions at the local level. Only during the second year of YEDPA and after a change in leadership did the office responsible for vocational education articulate an affirmative and positive policy encouraging closer local cooperation between vocational education and CETA youth programs. But a change in leadership in the Washington vocational education bureaucracy does not necessarily reflect a deep commitment there, and is hardly enough to assure a cooperative attitude among the diffuse, decentralized, and well-entrenched vocational education establishment. This is especially true when many in that establishment see direct conflicts between their prime objectives (serving employers) and YEDPA objectives (serving youth).

The Role of Professional Associations and Other Educational Interest Groups

There are pluralistic forces affecting local education agencies, each exerting a limited amount of influence. The federal and state governments exert their influence, in part, by dint of the money they bring. But there are other influences which are also interesting to study because they wield influence without money.

As a longstanding profession in American society, teaching has become organized in ways that represent numerous interests of its practitioners. Professional societies have been formed to advance the subspecialities within the teaching field, both by academic subject matter (mathematics, art, etc.) and by positions generally found in the organizational hierarchies of school systems (school board members, school administrators, teacher unions, etc.). State oriented organizations also exist to support the interests of legislatures, state administrators and even governors.

From interviews with representatives of 16 organizations and other education experts, it appears that these national organizations and their state affiliates have potential for promoting educational program policy. Furthermore, reacting to the reality of YEDPA and ready money, a considerable number already are advocating a more active role for their constituencies in some of the CETA-LEA collaboration activities. Almost all national education organizations publish information for their members, ranging from periodic, informal letters or newsletters to monthly professional journals. Some of the latter reach as many as 50,000 subscribers. Word about youth employment has already found its way into a number of these publications (e.g., the Community and Junior College Journal; and "Dateline Washington," the newsletter of the National Conference of State Legislatures), and in some cases, more definitive material describing program models has been disseminated. In much the same way as their publications may develop greater awareness and better understanding of CETA/YEDPA among their school

constituencies, so may the meetings of these organizations, which can draw thousands of members, become a forum for information dissemination and attitude change. Some associations, for example, have already devoted parts of programs or entire workshops to YEDPA and how it can be related to education.

The variety and number of ad hoc program efforts mounted by the various national education organizations serve to reinforce a belief in the interest and potential of these associations in furthering LEA-CETA linkages. While some of these may be self-serving, a number already have promoted positive action. The American Vocational Association, for example, conducted three conferences at which vocational educators learned about CETA/YEDPA models they could apply in their own school systems. An American Personnel and Guidance Association position paper dealt with better coordination between in-school and CETA counseling which, in New York state, resulted in collaborative conferences between representatives of both groups. The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges conducted a survey of its member institutions to determine how they were participating in CETA and what they would recommend in order to improve opportunities for participation. The National Association of State Boards of Education is trying to determine what educators can do in the implementation of YEDPA, and is also working with the National Governors' Association documenting models for award of academic credit for CETA work experience. The Council of Chief State School Officers has formed special committees, one on the youth employment act and another on career education.

Achieving Change Through Informal Networks

The network of education interest groups and professional associations can be no less potent than formal channels of authority created by systems of governance. Indeed, because common interests rather than imposed authority hold the groups together, there is good reason to believe these organizations can be even more influential than formal channels of authority in changing attitudes among teachers and education administrators. Unless and until employment and training objectives can be squared with the self interests of all the players, however, the federal emphasis on closer CETA-LEA cooperation will be running against the will of crucial players.

YEDPA architects almost certainly erred when they failed to consult adequately these facets of the education establishment. This kind of error is predictable and understandable in the source of developing hybrid legislation such as YEDPA because, invariably, one camp takes the initiative and it cannot be expected to know all the members of the other camps. But, the exclusion has been costly. Educators have felt that YEDPA was "done to them" by manpower policymakers trying to tell them how to do their jobs. Begging the question of whether educators should have any role in a national employment and training policy for youth, YEDPA put local manpower administrators in the position of specifying how educators would be involved. The YEDPA architects may have also erred (or just took a calculated risk) in failing

to recognize the lack of influence the federal CETA and education establishments could wield at the local level, and the necessity of enlisting the support of the education interest groups and associations as an alternate route for getting word to the local educators.

Saddled with the chore of implementing difficult legislation made more complicated by its one-sidedness, the U.S. Department of Labor discovered rather quickly the importance of getting the education interest groups and associations involved. The American Vocational Association, the Council of Great City Schools, the National Association of State Boards of Education all are receiving support now from the Department for a variety of activities that include identifying model employment and training programs involving schools, models for CETA-LEA cooperation, and CETA-LEA linkage issues on the local agenda. At least for the time being (while the money holds out) these education interests are adopting a more conciliatory stance with respect to mixing education and manpower programs, and are coaxing their respective constituencies as quickly as they can.

CONCLUSION

It is apparent that rapproachment between the education and manpower establishments is not likely to be quick, easy, systematic or consistent.

Because of the access that the Department of Labor has established with top leadership in the U.S. Office of Education and a number of education associations and interest groups, the superstructure of the education establishment shows signs of changing. But the signals have to be read cautiously. Education leaders can put YEDPA on meeting agendas, issue statements of support for closer CETA-LEA relations, and adopt a conciliatory stance towards youth employment and training programs. But they do not necessarily reflect the sentiments of their constituencies and certainly cannot deliver the support of those constituencies. Furthermore, much of the support of the education establishment has been coincident with technical assistance contracts and interagency agreements that have channeled resources to educators to take on new responsibilities to encourage closer education/manpower ties. It is not clear what would happen without those additional resources -- whether manpower programs for youth are sufficiently high priority that educators would displace activities supporting more traditional causes. In short, depth of commitment of even the Washington education establishment is not apparent and certainly not guaranteed -- yet.

But a lack of depth of commitment now does not rule out joint interests and concerted action by the manpower and education hierarchies. In fact, in a relatively brief span of time, YEDPA has produced a broad coalition of initial interest. What is needed now is time for that interest to take, and some follow-up policies that will foster conditions to permit the interest to take.

Top level conciliation between manpower and education interests does not assume peace at the local level. Before productive CETA-LEA partnerships can be formed locally, schools and local educators must make some substantive and administrative adaptations. Difficulties caused by mismatched planning cycles, funding uncertainty, the issue of academic credit, and the introduction of labor-market related classroom programs can be gotten around in time. The changes are not radical and all that is needed is the chance for the newness of the programs to wear off and for administrators to make adaptations in the way they do business. But there are also some more fundamental changes that seem necessary before large numbers of schools take an active role in employment and training programs. The income targeting provisions of YEDPA are emerging as the most serious impediments to CETA-LEA cooperation. So far, educator resistance to targeting has been manifested in objections on substantive and political grounds. School officials object to targeting jobs and employability development services to economically disadvantaged youth because economic status is not seen as a valid or reliable indicator of labor market services, and because exclusion of some youth from labor market services is hard to defend in an institution with as wide a political base as that of schools.

Targeting provisions seem to pose a more fundamental dilemma for educators, however. Public education has traditionally been geared to identifying student deficits and measuring achievement in terms of academic criteria. YEDPA is built on different premises and, in order to be successfully adopted by schools, requires changes in basic education attitudes. Even without the income eligibility criteria, there would be problems because YEDPA requires schools to view a wider spectrum of student capabilities than they traditionally have.

As with the minor administrative changes, the fundamental changes require time and patience. More precisely, they require subtle but constant pressure in the form of advocacy for change -- from inside and outside the education community -- and steady access and exposure to innovative education programs and administrative models that appear effective with regard to employment and training objectives.

Because of the relatively extended period of time it will take for joint CETA-LEA strategies to take hold, the proverbial plea for more stability, continuity, and predictability in CETA -- or at least youth programming -- becomes more compelling than ever. Progress in CETA-LEA relations must be cumulative. Yet that is difficult when the terms of CETA-LEA agreements are uncertain until two weeks before programming is due to begin, budget levels are changed in mid-stream, or CETA staff are constantly turning over. Strategically it is difficult when there is doubt about the durability of a national policy encouraging closer ties between education and manpower.

Of course, the plea for stability in CETA is chronic; but even a stable CETA system would be no panacea. Other factors affect collaboration between prime sponsors and schools. Given that one of the important YEDPA objectives is to change the way schools do business with respect to providing employment and training services for youth, an inevitable question is who should have authority over the money used to buy change. Should the money continue to be administered under the joint authority of schools and CETA prime sponsors, or should in-school programs under YEDPA be handled exclusively by the educators? The costs of the first strategy (now in effect) are already evident: friction between the two establishments and competition for the upper hand in deciding what programs are acceptable. But while the benefits of the second strategy might be more peaceful relations between CETA sponsors and educators, the costs will almost certainly be excessive loss in efficiency in getting CETA sponsors and LEAs to work together, and in getting LEAs to incorporate employment and training objectives nto their overall mission. This would be because increased isolation between the two institutions -- schools and local manpower administrators -- would be inevitable without the joint CETA-LEA agreement, a device that creates however artificially, a very real, joint vested interest.